

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

14	RECEIVED		Reference to the Control of the Cont		
2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONERS KRISTIN K. MAYES - CHAIRMANIN SE GARY PIERCE PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY BOB STUMP		P 3: 44 Minission Ontrol	Arizona Consussion Consussion DESCRIPTION OSCILLATION CONSUSSION OSCILLATIO	
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF UNS ELECTRIC, INC. FOR)	DOCKE	T NO. E-04204A-07-0365	
7 8 9	APPROVAL OF ITS RESIDENTIAL HVAC RETROFIT DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM))))		CE OF FILING DATA IN IANCE WITH DECISION NO. 70377	
10	UNS Electric ("UNS Electric" or the	"Con	pany"), throug	gh undersigned counsel, hereby	
11	files its data demonstrating the cost effectiveness of the 16 SEER and above units in compliance				
12	with Decision No. 70377 (June 13, 2008).				
13					
14	I. <u>INTRODUCTION.</u>				
15	Decision No. 70377, approved UNS Electric's Residential HVAC Retrofit Program a				
16	part of the Company's Demand-Side Management ("DSM") Portfolio for 2008 through 2012				
17	("DSM Portfolio"). Decision No. 70377 stated:				
18					
19	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that by September 30, 2009 UNS Electric, Inc. shall				
20	submit data to Docket Control demonstrating the cost-effectiveness of the 16				
21	SEER and above units and Staff shall review and report on this data by November				
22	15, 2009.				
23					
24	The data for the new 16 SEER and above cost-effectiveness calculation is in electroni				

format and is being filed directly with Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") Staff.

2526

27

II. HISTORY.

In the original program filing UNS Electric requested higher incentive offerings for 16 SEER and above HVAC equipment than the incentives offered for 14 or 15 SEER air conditioners ("AC") and heat pumps. Commission Staff's analysis at that time indicated a cost-benefit ratio of 1.1 for 14 or 15 SEER equipment, but due to comparatively high incremental costs, Commission Staff concluded that the AC and heat pump measures were not cost-effective for 16 SEER and above units. Therefore, Commission Staff recommended that incentives be provided only for 14 and 15 SEER ACs and heat pumps.

During the open meeting, the Commission debated whether offering incentives for lower-efficiency equipment and not for higher efficiency equipment would send the wrong message to customers. As a result, the Decision ordered that incentives be capped at a maximum of \$250 for 14 SEER and above measures and requested updated cost-effectiveness information for 16 SEER and above equipment.

III. NEW 16 SEER COST EFFECTIVENESS STUDY.

The cost data for the UNS Electric study was provided by four (4) Tucson area contractors. UNS Electric believes that pricing in Mohave County and Santa Cruz County will not significantly vary from information gathered from dealers in Tucson. Therefore, to eliminate the cost associated with a separate incremental cost study, UNS Electric elected to utilize the same cost information as that collected for Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP"). Two (2) of the four (4) contractors were participants in the TEP residential AC rebate program, while two (2) were non-participating contractors. Contractors were asked to provide information on the most common types of units being sold, including manufacturers, sizes, and SEER ratings. When contractors responded, they stated the following:

- In most cases they sell Tier 3 manufacturers such as Day & Night and Goodman.
- The industry is in the process of phasing out R-22 refrigerant to be replaced with R-410A units.

All of the pricing information provided was for R-410a, but it was stated that on average to upgrade from an R-22 system to R-410a is roughly an additional \$100. All pricing reflects single-phase units. The cost information was reported as ranges that include both heat pumps and gas/electric split AC systems. All of the cost estimates from the contractors were reported in ranges by SEER and tonnage and labor was included in the estimates. Further, variables that may affect pricing, and for which data was not collected include: the number of compressors; and accessories and add-ons.

The new cost data for 16 SEER, 18 SEER and 20 SEER ACs show that incremental costs are even higher than costs used in UNS Electric's original program filing. Using the updated cost and efficiency data in addition to the updated 2009 avoided cost information; UNS Electric calculated the cost-effectiveness of the 16 to 20 SEER equipment. The significant increase in incremental costs of the high efficiency equipment is detrimental to the cost-effectiveness calculation. As shown data filed electronically with Commission Staff, the 16 SEER equipment barely meets the TRC (1.02 TRC), but the 18 and 20 SEER equipment do not.

However, in the near future, UNS Electric will file an application for an expanded Residential Efficiency Program that will evaluate the benefits of duct sealing, early retirement of HVAC equipment, quality installation, as well as air-sealing and insulation. If approved, it will supersede program requirements in the current Residential HVAC Retrofit Program.

IV. CONCLUSION.

In compliance with Decision No. 70377, UNS Electric hereby files its data demonstrating the cost effectiveness of the 16 SEER and above units.

1	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this <u>20</u> day of September 2009.			
2	LINE Floatric Inc			
3	UNS Electrie, Inc.			
4	Philip J. Dion			
5	UniSource Energy Services One South Church Avenue, Suite 200 Tucson, Arizona 85701			
6	Attorney for UNS Electric, Inc.			
7	Automey for ONS Electre, me.			
8	Original and 13 copies of the foregoing			
9	filed this 30th day of September 2009 with:			
10	Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission			
11	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
12	Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed			
13	this 200 day of September 2009 to:			
14	Steve Olea Director, Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington			
15				
16	Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
17	Julie McNeely-Kirwan Utilities Division			
18	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington			
19	Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
20	Compliance Section Utilities Division			
21	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street			
22	Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
23	By: Seriea Burne			
24				
25				
26				